



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,325	02/24/2004	Robert A. Costa	204107-1 (5024-00302)	2639
26753	7590	03/17/2008		
ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP			EXAMINER	
100 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 1100			HUYNH, CONG LAC T	
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/786,325	Applicant(s) COSTA ET AL.
	Examiner CONG-LAC HUYNH	Art Unit 2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **24 January 2008**.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) **1-30** is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) **1-30** is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 1/24/08 to the application filed on 2/24/04.
2. Claims 1-30 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, 15, 20, 26-27 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "fist" (line 1) is a typographical error. Appropriate correction is required.
4. Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities: the word "fro" (line 2) is a typographical error. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding independent claim 1, it does not make sense when the claim is amended with "a batch of electronic images of the document" (line 4) since a batch of electronic images of one document does not actually convey the disclosure of the invention.

As pointed out by Applicants, the amended feature is supported in paragraph 20 of the application. According to this paragraph and figure 1, “*an enterprise 102 generates input documents 110, such as paper documents, and a specification 120, which contains instructions on how to create batches 150 from the input documents 110 The batch 150 includes a group of electronic images of the input documents 110 and descriptions 154 of the files formatted according to the specification 120.*” As such, the instructions included in the specification is for creating a batch 150, which contains electronic images of the input documents and description. Therefore:

- integrating is applied on a plurality of documents, and a plurality of documents are supplied with a specification comprising instructions of creating a batch of electronic files 152 and descriptions 154 of the input documents 110 (figure 1). And so, all “document” in claim 1 (and its dependent claims) should be in plural to be consistent with the disclosure of paragraph 20 and figure 1
- the limitation “..a specification comprising instructions for creating a description of the documents and a batch of electronic images of the document...” is not proper. It should be “... a specification comprising instructions for creating a batch comprising electronic images of the documents and a description of the documents...”
- the batch received in second format includes the descriptions and the electronic images of the documents, all in second format

In addition, it is suggested that independent claim 8, be amended to include the batch feature as amended to corresponding claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-7, 9-14 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-14, 26 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schoenberg (US 2004/0111297, 6/10/04, filed 12/10/02).

Regarding independent claim 1, Schoenberg discloses:

Art Unit: 2178

- supplying the document in the first format and a specification comprising instructions for creating a description of the document and a batch of electronic images of the document based on attributes of the document and syntax rules for the description (figure 2, [0038]-[0040]: paper document of a patient, which is the document in the first format, is provided with optical token including instructions of creating a description of the document, the instructions in the form of a bar code containing relevant information including the identity of the patient and authorization to accept and process the transmitted documents where the identify of the patient and the authorization are the attributes of the document and the format rules of the last name, first name included in the identity, or the authorization are syntax rules for the description; the cover page that can be sent along with the physical documents are formed a batch)
- receiving the batch in the second format ([0034]-[0035]: the patient document in electronic form, which is the second format, is received in the data store; [0023]: the host server receives the electronic form, which is the second format, of the document)
- receiving a description of the document generated responsive to the specification (figure 2, [0023]: the token of the document generated responsive to the data related to the document)
- importing the document in the second format into the data store responsive to the description (figure 2, #224: insert documents into patient file as instructed by

token; [0023], [0034]: entering the electronic form of the document into the electronic data store based on the destination instructions)

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Schoenberg discloses that the attributes of the document include at least one of the creation date of the document, the source of the document, content contained in the document and the location of the document on a storage medium ([0023], [0021]: attributes of the document includes content contained in the document).

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Schoenberg discloses receiving the document in the second format and the description of the document as part of a batch file also containing a plurality of other documents in the second format and associated description of the plurality of other documents, wherein the other documents in the second format are configured to be imported into the data store responsive to the associated description of the other documents in the second format ([0021], [0023]: a plurality of documents in electronic form with associate token are received by the host server system where the electronic form, which is the second format, are formed in response to the instructions of the token).

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Schoenberg discloses that the document in the first format comprises a paper document, and the document in the second format comprises an electronic file [0021], [0023], [0034]-[0035].

Art Unit: 2178

Claims 8-9, 13-14 are for a system for method claims 1-3, 7 and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 26 is for a computer program product of method claims 1, 5-6, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 4-6, 10-12, 15-25, 27-30 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenberg as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Aridor et al. (US 2004/0215650, 10/28/04, filed 10/11/02).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Schoenberg does not disclose indexing the document imported into the data store based on indexing data contained in the description.

Aridor discloses indexing the document imported into the data store based on indexing data contained in the description (figure 14, [0107]-[0108]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Aridor into Schoenberg since Aridor provides indexing the documents stored in the file system thus motivating to incorporate the indexing feature into the data store containing electronic documents converted from the paper documents to easily keep track documents in the data store as well as quickly retrieve a requested document from the data store.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Schoenberg does not disclose that the specification comprises an XML Document Type Definition that describes element names and XML syntax rules for creating a description of the document.

Aridor discloses that the specification comprises an XML Document Type Definition that describes element names and XML syntax rules for creating a description of the document ([0108], [0110]-[0112]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Aridor into Schoenberg for using XML DTD for creating a description of the document in XML, a language flexible for creating documents, so that

the document in paper format can be effectively described how it will be in electronic form.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Schoenberg does not disclose that the description comprises a well-formed XML document file generated responsive to the XML Document Type Definition.

Aridor discloses that the description comprises a well-formed XML document file generated responsive to the XML Document Type Definition ([0110]-[0114]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Aridor into Schoenberg for obtaining a description of a paper document in XML form according to a DTD providing the specific syntax for presenting the paper document in an electronic form.

Claims 10-12 are a system for method claims 4-6, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 15, Schoenberg discloses:

- receiving the electronic files and the descriptions of the files, the descriptions descriptive of attributes of the electronic files and generated responsive to a specification comprising instructions for describing the files and syntax rules for the descriptions ([0034]-[0035]: the electronic files with the tokens are stored in the data store implies that the electronic files and their descriptions are received

where the tokens include instructions instructing how the documents are rendered)

- locating the electronic files on a storage medium based on the information contained within the descriptions ([0038]: locating the document in the data store via the token of the document)
- copying the electronic files into the data store (figure 2: insert documents into patient files, [0023]: enter the electronic documents into the data store shows the claimed copying)

Schoenberg does not disclose:

- extracting indexing data associated with the electronic files from the descriptions of the electronic files
- indexing the electronic files in the data store responsive to the indexing data extracted from the descriptions of the electronic files

Aridor discloses:

- extracting indexing data associated with the electronic files from the descriptions of the electronic files ([0032]-[0034], [0042]: extracting data from the index responsive to the specification)
- indexing the electronic files in the data store responsive to the indexing data extracted from the description of the electronic files ([0032], [0107]-[0108])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Aridor into Schoenberg since Aridor provides indexing the documents stored in the file system based on the descriptions of the electronic files thus

Art Unit: 2178

motivating to incorporate the indexing feature into the data store containing electronic documents to easily keep track documents in the data store as well as quickly retrieve a requested document from the data store.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Schoenberg does not discloses creating references in an index to the electronic files in the data store responsive to the indexing data to enable subsequent access to the files by a user application using the index.

Aridor discloses creating references in an index to the electronic files in the data store responsive to the indexing data to enable subsequent access to the files by a user application using the index ([0108], [0114]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Aridor into Schoenberg for quickly accessing to the files and subsequently accessing the files using the index of the files in the data store.

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 15, Schoenberg discloses receiving the electronic files and the descriptions of the files in the form of the single batch (figure 2: documents and token in a single batch when sent and are received and inserted into patient file at the host server).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 15, Schoenberg does not disclose indexing the electronic files in the data store responsive to batch-level indexing data extracted from the description of the electronic files.

Aridor discloses indexing the electronic files in the data store responsive to batch-level indexing data extracted from the description of the electronic files ([0040]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Aridor into Schoenberg for quickly retrieving a document in request based on the indices of the electronic files in the data store.

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent on claim 15, Schoenberg does not disclose:

- locating valid indexing data about the electronic files contained in the descriptions responsive to the syntax rules in the specification
- extracting valid indexing data from the description
- outputting the valid indexing data to the data store

Aridor discloses:

- locating valid indexing data about the electronic files contained in the descriptions responsive to the syntax rules in the specification (0033)-[0034]: extracting a document identifier from one of the posting of the values where these data is included in the index implies that the claimed locating is performed so that said valid indexing data can be extracted)

- extracting valid indexing data from the description (0033)-[0034], [0042]:
extracting a document identifier from one of the posting of the values where
these data is included in the index)
- outputting the valid indexing data to the data store [0032]: displaying the index of
the data in the repository)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Aridor into Schoenberg for providing a way to quickly retrieve a requested document via the displayed index of data of the repository where the index data extracted from the descriptions of the documents.

Claims 20-25 are for an apparatus of method claims 15-19, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 27-30 are for a computer program product of method claims 15-16, 18-19, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 1/24/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent claim 1, Applicants argue that Schoenberg does not teach a specification comprising instructions for creating a description of the document based on attributes of the document and syntax rules of the description (remarks, page 13).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Schoenberg discloses the cover page, which is equivalent to the specification, comprises tokens, which are instructions for creating a description of the document based on attributes of the document and syntax rules for the description (figure 2, [0038]-[0040]: the tokens in the cover page are instructions in the form of a bar code containing relevant information including the identity of the patient and authorization to accept and process the transmitted documents where the identify of the patient and the authorization are the attributes of the document and the format rules of the last name, first name included in the identity, or the authorization are syntax rules for the description).

Applicants argue that Schoenberg does not teach the specification of the present application where the specification originates from an enterprise.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The fax cover is equivalent to the specification as claimed where the fax cover includes tokens which are instructions containing information of the identity of the patient and authorization to accept and process the transmitted document. The fax cover, therefore, originates from the origination place of the document since the fax cover is created from the origination place of the document so that it is transmitted along with the documents.

Applicants argue that Schoenberg does not teach creating a description of a document and a batch of electronic images of the document based on attributes of the document and syntax rules for the description, and sending those documents back to a datastore and an enterprise to be indexed according to a description.

In response to the argument, it is noted that creating a batch of electronic images of the document is not proper since a batch includes electronic images of a plurality of input documents and descriptions of the documents (figure 1, #150, #152, #154). Inserting the documents and the fax cover in a specific location of the patient file ([0041]) shows that those documents are sent to a datastore.

Applicants argue that Schoenberg and the combination of Schoenberg and Aridor do not include a specification as taught in claims 15, 20, and 27.

As mentioned above, the cover sheet in Schoenberg is considered a specification since it includes tokens which are instructions for processing the documents based on the attributes of the documents. The attributes as required in the invention are patient name, internal patient ID, patient medical record number and document type by which an input document could be described (remarks, page 10). The token in Schoenberg is a bar code including the identity of the patient ([0039]) which means the information such as patient name, patient ID, etc. to identify a patient. Therefore, the specification in Schoenberg is based on the attributes of the documents.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lawton et al. (US 5,832,100). Altman (US 6,226,767).

Turner et al. (US 6,633,742). Maruyama et al. (US 2003/0046351).

Chakraborty (US 2003/0088825). Ragnet et al. (US 2004/0172586).

Ito et al. (US 2005/0088647). Sato et al. (US 2005/0160109).

Clarke et al. (US 2007/0198919).

Kabel et al., Ontologies for Indexing Technical Manuals for Instruction, Google June 1999, pages 1-10.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs (8:30-7:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/CONG-LAC HUYNH/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178
03/11/08

Application/Control Number: 10/786,325

Art Unit: 2178

Page 18